

1 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP

Seth P. Waxman

2 Randolph D. Moss

Todd Zubler

3 Brian M. Boynton #222193

2445 M Street, N.W.

4 Washington, D.C. 20037-1420

5 BAKER, MANOCK & JENSEN

A Professional Corporation

6 Robert D. Wilkinson #100478

Fig Garden Financial center

7 5260 North Palm Avenue, Fourth Floor

Fresno, California 93704-2209

8 Counsel for Defendant THE CALIFORNIA TABLE GRAPE COMMISSION

9
10 LAW OFFICES OF BRIAN C. LEIGHTON

Brian C. Leighton #090907

11 701 Pollasky Avenue

Clovis, California 93612

12 Counsel for Plaintiffs DELANO FARMS COMPANY, THE SUSAN NEILL COMPANY, and
13 LUCAS BROS. PARTNERSHIP

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 DELANO FARMS COMPANY,)

17 a Washington corporation,)

THE SUSAN NEILL COMPANY,)

18 a California corporation,)

LUCAS BROS. PARTNERSHIP,)

19 a California Partnership,)

20 Plaintiffs,)

21 v.)

22 THE CALIFORNIA TABLE)

GRAPE COMMISSION,)

23 Defendant.)

Case No. CV-F-96-6053 OWW DLB

STIPULATION AND ORDER
MODIFYING DATES AND EXTENDING
PAGE LIMITS

WHEREAS Defendant the California Table Grape Commission intends to file a motion for summary judgment raising a number of constitutional defenses to Plaintiffs' First Amendment challenge to the Ketchum Act;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs may file a cross-motion for summary judgment on their First Amendment claims;

WHEREAS the current schedule calls for the parties to file motions for summary judgment on February 10, 2006, oppositions to motions for summary judgment on March 10, 2006, and replies in support of motions for summary judgment on March 24, 2006;

WHEREAS professional and personal commitments of counsel for Plaintiffs have made adherence to the current schedule difficult;

WHEREAS counsel for the parties have conferred and agree that a two-week extension of the current schedule will facilitate effective briefing of the anticipated motion or motions for summary judgment; and

WHEREAS the parties agree that in order effectively to present the issues likely to arise in a motion or motions for summary judgment they will need to submit briefs in excess of the 25-page limit for opening and opposition briefs and the 10-page limit for reply briefs set in the Court's Standing Order;

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by the parties to this action, through their respective attorneys of record, that the page limit for briefs in support of any motions for summary judgment be extended to 50 pages, that the page limit for briefs in opposition to any such motions be extended to 35 pages, that the page limit for reply briefs in support of any such motions be extended to 25 pages, and that the following scheduling revisions be adopted by the Court:

Event	Revised Date
Proposed Statements of Undisputed Facts Filed with the Court	February 24, 2006
Motions for Summary Judgment	February 24, 2006

1	Oppositions to Motions for Summary Judgment	March 24, 2006
2	Replies to Motions for Summary Judgment	April 7, 2006

3
4
5 Dated: January 26, 2006

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
Seth P. Waxman
Randolph D. Moss
Todd Zubler
Brian M. Boynton

8 BAKER, MANOCK & JENSEN
9 Robert D. Wilkinson

10 By /s/ Brian M. Boynton
11 Brian M. Boynton

12 Counsel for Defendant THE CALIFORNIA TABLE
13 GRAPE COMMISSION

14 Dated: January 26, 2006

LAW OFFICES OF BRIAN C. LEIGHTON

16 By /s/ Brian C. Leighton (as authorized 1-25-06)
17 Brian C. Leighton

18 Counsel for Plaintiffs DELANO FARMS COMPANY,
19 THE SUSAN NEILL COMPANY, and LUCAS
20 BROS. PARTNERSHIP

21 **ORDER**

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: __Jan. 27, 2006

/s/ OLIVER W. WANGER_____
24 _____
25 Oliver W. Wanger
26 United States District Judge
27
28